



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

my

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,533	01/23/2004	David C. Paul	GMI.0009.US	5342

7590 07/13/2004
John P. Mulgrew
11012 Langton Arms Ct
Oakton, VA 22124

EXAMINER

PHILOGENE, PEDRO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3732

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

YW

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/762,533	Applicant(s) PAUL ET AL.	
	Examiner Pedro Philogene	Art Unit 3732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/23/04
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-59 of copending Application No. 10/443,755. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference between these two sets of claims is that in the later filed case the second flexible element is omitted. Clearly applicant is attempting to obtain broader coverage in the claims of the latter. The question then becomes – Does the omission of the second flexible element in the later application constitute an obvious expedient to one of ordinary skill in the art?

It is well settled that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the function as before. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Thus the controlling fact is that patent protection for the flexible spine stabilization system, fully disclosed in and covered by the claims of the earlier filed application, would be extended by the allowance of the claims in the later

Art Unit: 3732

filed application. As already stated, nothing prevented applicant from presenting the claims in the later filed application for examination during the prosecution of the earlier filed application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5,22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin (5,423,816).

With respect to claim 1, Lin discloses a flexible spine stabilization system, as best seen in FIGS.1-4, comprising a first rod, as best seen in FIGS.2,4, having first end portions and a second end portion, a first flexible element(10) having at least a first slit; as best seen in FIGS.2,4; formed therein, wherein the first flexible element is disposed between the first and second end portion, wherein a first flexible element is integrally formed between the first and second rod portions (FIGS.2,4) and wherein the first flexible element permits motion of the first end portion relative to the first end portion; as best seen in FIGS.2,4 a first fastener (60) capable of connecting with the first end portion a second fastener capable of connecting with the second end portion; as best seen in FIGS.2,4.

Art Unit: 3732

With respect to claims 2-5, 22-29 Commarmond discloses all the limitations as set forth in column 2, lines 28-68, column 3-lines 1-52, and as best seen in FIGS.1-4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-21, 30,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (5,423,816).

With respect to claims 6-21,30,31, it is noted that Lin did not teach of a different degrees and dimension of the flexible elements; as claimed by applicant. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reach the optimum range, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. It has also been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6,523,812	2-2003	Spinks et al.
5,415,661	05-1995	Holmes


5,672,175	09-1997	Martin
4,773,402	09-1988	Asher et al.
5,649,925	7-1997	Barbera Alacreu
5,180,393	01-1993	Commarmond

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (703) 308-2252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P Shaver can be reached on (703) 308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pedro Philogene
July 08, 2004


PEDRO PHILOGENE
PRIMARY EXAMINER